Serial No.: 10/521,120 Amendment dated April 28, 2008 Reply to OA of Oct. 30, 2007

Docket No.: 66307-331-7

<u>REMARKS</u>

By this Amendment the specification has been amended to include topic headings, claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of claim 2 (now canceled) and to define another security feature which is concealed when the second section of the substrate is adhered in a non-viewing position visible in reflected light when the second section is lifted to a viewing position, and claim 12 has been corrected. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding Office Action the examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-8, 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingram et al in view of Cote et al., she has rejected claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over these same two patents, further in view of "Admitted Prior Art," she has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the same two patents, further in view of Pusateri et al., she has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the same two patents, further in view of Gartner et al., and she has rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the same two patents, further in view of Buck.

The inventor asserts that these rejections must be withdrawn.

Ingram describes a package with a label for displaying product information, not a security label. Ingram's label does, however, have a first portion 34 to which an adhesive is applied for adhering the label to

Serial No.: 10/521,120 Amendment dated April 28, 2008 Reply to OA of Oct. 30, 2007

Docket No.: 66307-331-7

the package and a second portion 36, which is releasably adherable to the first portion in a similar manner to the label of the present invention. When the second section is lifted into a viewing position, printed information which is printed across the first and second portions and was previously concealed, is displayed. However, Ingram does <u>not</u> describe a security feature which is incorporated in or on the second section of the label and which is visible in transmissive light when the second section is lifted into a viewing position, as is required by the currently amended claim 1.

Cote describes a security label which includes a security feature in the form of a security thread. However, the label is designed to be adhered to an article such that the security thread is permanently displayed and can be viewed in reflected light only. With regard to the paragraph highlighted by the examiner which describes a security element hidden between a dark label and the item to which the label is adhered, and only visually detectable when the label is pulled up or removed, this does not describe any other type of security feature other than a security element. Thus, it must be read onto the previous description and thus only discloses a security thread which is visually and machine inspectable in reflected light.

With regard to the AAPA, while it is acknowledged that security elements have different perceptions in reflected and visible light, this is not relevant to the amended claim 1, which requires the specific

Serial No.: 10/521,120 Amendment dated April 28, 2008

Reply to OA of Oct. 30, 2007

Docket No.: 66307-331-7

combination of a security feature which is hidden until the second section is lifted into the viewing position, and is then visible in transmissive light,

and another security feature which is visible in reflected light.

The particular claimed combination is therefore a considerable

improvement over the prior art in that it can be checked for authenticity

before application and in situ by viewing in both transmitted and reflected

light. Such labels provide a high degree of security not known in the prior

art, because they cannot be accurately photocopied due to the use of

both sides of the label, even if the label is removed from the article to

which it is attached. The combination of prior art cited by the examiner

does not disclose this particular combination and features and neither is it

obvious.

And nothing in Pusateri et al., Gartner et al. or Buck would suggest

otherwise.

Favorable reevaluation of this application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLL

By:

Richard H. Tušhin

Registration No. 27,297

Franklin Square, Third Floor West

1300 I Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-3353

(202) 906-8600

9